

# TAXONOMIC NOTES ON THE CERAMBYCIDAE (COLEOPTERA)

BY

E. F. GILMOUR

*The Museum, Waterdale, Doncaster, England*

The following notes are the result of examination of various allied genera during identification of material. It is hoped that they will prove of use to workers particularly in some groups of the smaller East Indian Lamiinae.

## CERAMBYCINAE

### 1. *Trinophylum cribratum* Bates, 1878

*Callidium impressipenne* Pic, 1948. Syn. nov.

This species, upon which I published some notes (*Ent. Month. Mag.*, 1948, vol. 84, p. 12—16, figs. 1—3), has been described as a new species by M. PIC L'Echange, 1948, vol. 64, p. 6), from the Isle of Wight. Its introduction from Northern India I have discussed in the aforesaid paper.

## LAMIINAE

### 2. *Neoegesina margaretae* (Gilmour) comb. nov.

This species, from Sumatra, which I described as *Enispia margaretae* Gilmour (*Ent. Month. Mag.*, 1948, vol. 84, p. 141, fig. 1) belongs to the genus *Neoegesina* Fisher (*Philipp. J. Sci.*, 1925, vol. 28, p. 215). It is closely allied to *N. albo-maculata* Fisher (l.c., p. 220) from Borneo, but differs in lacking the median pronotal pale longitudinal band and the two anterior spots. The elytral markings are apparently almost identical in the two species.

### 3. *Chaetacanthidius cristatus* (Gahan) comb. nov.

*Phlyarus cristatus* Gahan (*Ann. Mus Civ. Genova*, 1907, ser. 3, vol. 3, p. 95) does not belong to the genus *Phlyarus* Pascoe (*Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond.*, 1858, ser. 2, vol. 4, p. 244) but to the genus *Chaetacanthidius* Gilmour (*Ent. Month. Mag.*, 1948, vol. 84, p. 17). Its generic structure is identical with that of the genotype, *C. unifasciatus* Gilmour (l.c., figs. 1—3), in having the four basal elytral spines, and in the anterior and posterior tibial characters. I have examined a Cotype (?) from Perak (Malacca) of GAHAN's type series and another specimen in my own collection from the same locality, as well as the type of *Phlyarus basalis* Pascoe, and they are quite generically distinct.

*Chaetacanthidius cristatus* (Gahan) differs conspicuously from *C. unifasciatus*

Gilmour (which is almost wholly black) in the scape and second antennal segment, the femora, the base of the pronotum and the base of the elytra being light ferruginous (well-defined and not due to immaturity).

#### 4. *Dyemus purpureopulchra* (Gilmour) comb. nov.

This species, from Halmahera, which I described as *Athylia purpureopulchra* Gilmour (*Ent. Month. Mag.*, 1948, vol. 84, p. 146, fig. 4) belongs to the genus *Dyemus* Pascoe (*Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond.*, 1864, ser. 3, vol. 3, p. 28, 54), which is not a synonym of *Enispia* Pascoe (l.c., p. 28, 50) as given by AURIVILLIUS (*Col. Cat. ed. JUNK-SCHENKLING*, 1922, pars 73, p. 278), but is a valid genus in my opinion. The genus *Athylia* Pascoe is quite distinct from *Dyemus* Pascoe in having a minute lateral pronotal tooth which is not present in *D. purpureopulchra* (Gilmour).

A comparison with PASCOE's types in the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) which was not possible when my species was described, shows that *D. purpureopulchra* (Gilmour) is closely allied to *D. laevicollis* Pascoe. In the British Museum's short series, which PASCOE (I presume) placed under this name (he gives five localities in the original description), there are actually two species, which he had decided were variations. One of these is labelled as the type of *D. laevicollis* Pascoe. The others are distinct and similar in colour and markings to the type of *D. purpureopulchra* (Gilmour). Comparison of PASCOE's (*Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond.*, 1864, ser. 3, vol. 3, pl. 3, fig. 9) and my own figures will show some obvious differences, the most apparent being that the distinct, somewhat circular and ocellated grey mark towards the elytral apex in *purpureopulchra* Gilmour, is not present as such in *laevicollis* Pascoe.